IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| In re Application of: |) Art Unit: 1639 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| CHRISTENSEN, et al. | Examiner: STEELE, A. |
| Serial No.: 10/529,397 |) Washington, D.C. |
| Filed: March 28, 2005 |) January 8, 2009 |
| For: SPATIALLY ENCODED POLYMER MATRIX |) Docket No.: CHRISTENSEN=12 |
| |) Confirmation No.: 6716 |

ELECTION WITH TRAVERSE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the species restriction requirement mailed December 15, 2008, applicants respond as follows.

1. We believe that the restriction is moot because claims 104-105 have been cancelled on even date herewith. However, to avoid any question of responsiveness, we hereby elect with traverse species 2 - relative positions.

It is noted that relative positions are already cited in, e.g., withdrawn claim 43, and that absolute positions (the "distance matrix") are optionally determined from those positions.

2. While it may seem that relative and absolute positions are mutually exclusive, they are clearly interdependent. That is, in claim 43, we use the relative positions in the course of determining the absolute ones. And clearly, knowing absolute positions, one could calculate the relative positions. Hence,

USSN - 10/529,397

restriction analysis must treat these as related species.

The restriction should also be withdrawn on the ground that claims (e.g., claim 32) are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

A Commence of the Commence of

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By:

Iver P. Cooper

Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile: (202) 737-3528

IPC:lms

 ${\tt G:\q-i\hoib\CHRISTENSEN12\christensen12.pto\ election traverse.wpd}$